## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/715,681	11/17/2000	Yoav Raz	EMS-00202	EMS-00202 4765	
26339 75	90 06/21/2006		EXAM	INER	
MUIRHEAD AND SATURNELLI, LLC 200 FRIBERG PARKWAY, SUITE 1001			DADA, BEEMNET W		
	GH, MA 01581		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE		
			2135		
			DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006	DATE MAILED: 06/21/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/715,681	RAZ ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Beemnet W. Dada	2135				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 01 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of						
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follon places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compaction following time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or  (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling						
the non-allowable claim(s).  7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7,22-28 and 41-52</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7,22-20 and 47-32.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.  7. The affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a (1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
<ul> <li>11.          ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ance because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued that the art on record fails to teach determining physical portions of the storage device that have been modified since a previous virus scan using information about the physical portions without using information about a file structure, a file system, or a file type and ... scanning is performed without using information about a file structure, a file system. Examiner disagrees. Examiner would point out that, as discussed in the previous office action Waldin (US 6,094,731) teaches scanning at least parts of the physical portions for viruses, wherein scanning performed without using information about a file structure, a file system or a file type [column 6, lines 43-46, column 7, lines 37-46, column 3, lines 5-45]. Waldin et al. specifically teaches scanning for viruses regardless of the content of the sectors [column 7, line 64 - column 8, line 8] and regardless of the file format [column 3, lines 40-45], which meets the claim language. Examiner asserts that Waldin et al. teaches the claim limitations and therefore the rejection is respectfully maintained.

KIM VU

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100